



County of San Diego

FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMISSION

County Operations Center, 5555 Overland Avenue, M.S. 0384
San Diego, California 92123-1295

MINUTES REGULAR MEETING SAN DIEGO COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMISSION THURSDAY, JUNE 7, 2001

- Commissioners Present:** Hariet Acton, Mary Allison, Joe Gerry, Hadley Johnson, and Mike Sholders
- Commissioners Excused:** Kent Trimble and Kenneth Wood
- Staff Present:** Doug Isbell, Rodger Johnson, Mark Perrett, George Ream, John Snyder, Ivanka Todt, Hung Tran, and Jiljean Walther
- Guests Present:** Mr. and Mrs. Reynolds, property owners; Mr. Espenosa, property owner; Bill Schwartz, Ferry Ranch developer counsel

The regular meeting of the San Diego County Flood Control District Advisory Commission was called to order at 11:01 a.m. on Thursday, June 7, 2001, at the Lakeside Fire Protection District, 12365 Parkside Street, Lakeside, California by Chairman Joe Gerry.

1. Minutes of May 3, 2001 Meeting

ACTION: Commissioner Sholders moved to approve the Minutes of May 3, 2001, as corrected under Item 10. Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion; motion carried with Commissioner Acton abstaining.

2. Expenditure and Status Report

Rodger Johnson stated that Flood Control is beginning to receive billing on the hydrology manual, so that expenditure will appear on future reports.

3. Fiscal Year 2001-2002 Proposed Budget

Doug Isbell stated that the budget reflects modifications made at the last meeting to include funding for the Flood Control Design Manual and additional engineering position. Mr. Isbell further stated that the year-end balance projection is \$2.675 million as of June 30, 2001 in the Flood Control fund and next year with 100% expenditure, it would drop to \$1.08 million. It is unlikely there will be 100%

expenditure, so the fiscal year should end with about \$2 million in the Flood Control fund. Mr. Isbell stated that staff would develop a five-year Capital Improvement expenditure projection by Special Drainage Area.

4. Project Update

a. Hillsdale Drive

Mark Perrett distributed "Hillsdale Watershed Master Plan"¹. This project is the combination of a hydrology study and a master plan in the Valle de Oro area (SDA-2). Phase 1 of the project is to identify improvement needs and will be completed December 2001 by a consultant (RBF). Phase 2 will design a capital project based upon the results of the Master Plan. RBF has completed the initial draft of the study.

b. Hart Drive Channel Improvements

Mr. Perrett distributed "Hart Drive Channel Improvements"². Hart Drive is located in the Bostonia area (SDA-5). The plan is to bring the channel up to 100-year standards and relieve mandatory flood insurance requirements. A preliminary engineering report is being prepared by a consultant, Berryman & Henigar, with a completion date of December 2001. A channel improvement project will be chosen from alternatives identified in the preliminary engineering report (PER), with final design completed by May 2002.

5. Los Napolitos Project

Hung Tran stated that a small subdivision, TM 4570, was completed in 1987. Only on-site drainage facilities were constructed; off-site facilities were designed, but not completed. Mr. and Mrs. Reynolds, one of the homeowners living along the unimproved channel, have requested an evaluation of the system. It was determined that this is an incomplete SDA-6 master plan facility. The project cost estimate is approximately \$200,000 to \$300,000.

Mr. Reynolds stated that he and his wife bought their house 1½ years ago. They are having major erosion problems and are losing a shed on their property. He was told that Flood Control maintains the channel once every year. Mrs. Reynolds questioned whose liability it is if children play around this pipe and become injured.

Mr. Espenoza (who has owned his property on an adjacent subdivision since 1979) questioned why the developer was not required to finish that portion of the storm drain. He also stated that he has not seen any maintenance done on this facility. Mr. Espenoza questioned what monies would be used to build this storm drain, the County's capital budget or tax fee? Mr. Isbell explained that Flood Control District funds would be used.

Commissioner Johnson commented that he would not be in favor of the project if easements cannot be obtained first.

Commissioner Sholders wanted staff to review the hydraulic capacity of the proposed facility to adequately convey the flow from the existing culvert. Staff will review and report back to the Commission in September.

ACTION: Commissioner Acton moved to recommend approval for the project design and environmental study in FY 01-02, with construction to follow in FY 02-03. Commissioner Sholders seconded; motion carried unanimously.

6. Central Avenue Proposition 13 Application

Mr. Isbell stated that staff had a beneficial on-site meeting with representatives from the Department of Water Resources. Proposition 13's primary focus is creating new wetland habitats, and in order to remain competitive, projects must include such elements in addition to channelization. As the project is currently proposed, it is not likely to make the first cut for project funding. They are looking for several projects that meet the goal of Prop 13 as pilot projects. A formal application process for any balance of the Prop 13 monies is anticipated in the next few months. The potential solution is to look upstream of Central Avenue at the ability to create a detention basin in the current low area that feeds this project, which could become habitat. Staff will conduct engineering studies to determine feasibility, constraints and cost and, very likely, submit an amended application. This experience showed staff that creative projects involving wetlands and detention must be included in order to receive grant-funding consideration.

Mr. Isbell stated that at this point in time design funding would come from SDA funds. He further stated that for major projects it is necessary to locally fund the design and environmental analysis before the grant application is submitted, and then lobby Sacramento for funding. Half the Prop 13 money was allocated to projects through the political process.

John Snyder stated that Prop 13 appears to be the most available money at this point, but staff is still exploring other types of funding. Alternatives are being examined, such as a stormwater assessment district covering the county. He further stated that if there were an additional funding source developed, perhaps there would be a way to get in some portion of it for water quality aspects.

Staff is currently negotiating the scope and fees with RBF to perform a PER. The PER will evaluate the feasibility of constructing a detention basin and upstream wetlands.

ACTION: Commissioner Action moved to develop a policy where the stormwater quality aspects of flood control facilities are funded by other than SDA funds. This policy would identify additional funding sources for the water quality aspects of flood control due to the new stormwater permit. Commissioner Sholders seconded; motion carried unanimously.

7. Final Draft: Board Policy A-100

George Ream stated that this Policy would be incorporated into a Board letter along with other policies and presented to the Board of Supervisors in the near future.

8. Ferry Ranch Project Update

Mr. Tran distributed a draft project cost estimate³ showing a detailed cost breakdown for the Ferry Ranch project. Doug Isbell stated that staff has reached an agreement with the RWQCB on the level of maintenance. Basically, the County will take over maintenance of the channel upon completion of construction. He further stated that the cost of the project has gone up substantially, due to the fact that the project requires use of a natural channel with an Armorloc system that allows vegetative growth to occur in the channel.

Mr. Isbell stated that the channel downstream of the development does not have the capacity to carry the 100-year flood. It was proposed in the master plan to be a concrete channel. The developer is channelizing the water carrying it through the subdivision, and if it were to be released at the end of the subdivision into the existing channel, there would be severe erosion because the velocity is much more than a natural channel could handle.

Bill Schwartz, an attorney who represents Ferry Ranch, stated that when they began this process they thought they could do a concrete channel and some time after the subdivision map was approved with those requirements, they found that the RWQCB wants a soft-lined channel. The developers have spent the better part of two years working with RWQCB trying to get all the problems worked out. Mr. Schwartz recognized that the costs are now higher. He urged the Commissioners to take all these points into consideration and go forward and recommend approval of this project to the Board of Directors of the Flood Control District.

Mr. Schwartz stated the incorporation of the off-site portion is intended to retain the waters within a particular channel, and if it is not retained the water will fan out onto other property. The developers are required by the map resolution to go forward and complete these off-site improvements, and his client is moving forward in an effort to complete the transaction on this property.

Mr. Isbell stated that it would have been possible to design this facility bringing the existing grass lined channel configuration that is downstream of this project up through the undeveloped area. Mr. Tran stated that the bottom is at least 30 feet wide. Mr. Isbell stated that 75-80 feet or more would have been taken from right-of-way. The current channel runs down the back of large lots.

Mr. Isbell stated that the subdivision has to carry the 100-year flow down to the established grass lined channel. There are two choices; either approve an Armorloc channelized system that minimizes right-of-way, or have the engineer go back and design an open channel system that still may need armorized sides and require more right-of-way. Mr. Isbell noted that the Flood Control Ordinance states that the developer shall be reimbursed 100% off-site and 50% on-site.

Mr. Isbell stated that the agreement (including final cost estimates) needs to be approved in concept so it can be taken to the Board of Supervisors prior to the subdivider going in with the final map. The agreement is worded in such a way that the developer will submit the fixed cost items with detailed backup along with an audit. The District will reimburse the developer for what is paid to the contractor through the contract and change orders.

ACTION: Commissioner Allison moved to recommend execution of agreement to the Board of Supervisors of the Flood Control District for reimbursement of 50% on-site and 100% off-site costs for the drainage facility. Further, the Commission wishes to draw to the Board of Supervisors' attention that this recommendation includes increased costs due to water quality requirements by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Seconded by Commissioner Action; motion carried unanimously.

9. Watershed Management Plans

Mr. Isbell recommended carrying over the Watershed Management Plan to the September 2001 meeting.

10. Other Business

Mr. Isbell stated that Flood Control has received applications for the DPW Manager position to manage the Wastewater and Flood Control Sections. Interviews will be conducted on June 21, 2001. Chairman Gerry volunteered to participate in the interview panel.

Chairman Gerry announced that Dianne Jacob's office is holding a meeting concerning the Electricity Action Crisis Action Plan in the Copper Room, San Diego Concourse, 200 "C" Street, 1:00 p.m., June 11, 2001 and, also, at 7:00 p.m. in the El Cajon Community Center.

Chairman Gerry adjourned the meeting at 1:43 p.m.

ATTEST:

DOUGLAS M. ISBELL, Secretary
San Diego County Flood Control
District Advisory Commission

JOE GERRY, Chairman
San Diego County Flood Control
District Advisory Commission

Minutes prepared by Jiljean Walther

Handouts:

¹ Hillsdale Road Watershed

² Hart Drive Channel Improvements

³ Ferry Ranch Flood Control Facility – Project Cost Estimate / Flood Control District Responsibility